

APR 23 1983

ALEXANDER L. STEVENS,
CLERK

No. 82-1474

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

CHARLES R. HOOVER, HOWARD H. KARMAN,
ROBERT D. MYERS and HAROLD J. WOLFINGER,

Petitioners,

vs.

EDWARD RONWIN,

Respondent.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO
PETITIONERS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF RE
PETITION FOR CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

EDWARD RONWIN
P.O. Box 3585
Urbandale, Iowa 50322
(515) 223-8819
Respondent pro se

No. 82-1474

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

CHARLES R. HOOVER, HOWARD H. KARMAN,
ROBERT D. MYERS and HAROLD J. WOLFINGER,
Petitioners,
vs.
EDWARD RONWIN,
Respondent.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO
PETITIONERS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF RE
PETITION FOR CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

On or about April 22, 1983, Petitioners
filed a "Supplemental Brief Re Petition
for Certiorari to the United States Court
of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit" in which
Petitioners argue that this Court's deci-
sion in District of Columbia Court of Ap-
peals v. Feldman, 51 U.S.L.W. 4285 (No.81-

1335) holding that in Bar admission decisions, lower federal courts "do not have jurisdiction...over challenges to state court decisions in particular cases arising out of judicial proceedings even if those challenges allege that the state court's action was unconstitutional," 51 U.S.L.W. at 4292, justifies summary vacation of this matter.

Petitioners fail to inform this Court that no state court decision is involved. Respondent's Complaint did not ask for admission to the Arizona State Bar and did not challenge a state court decision. The Complaint merely attacked Petitioners' use of a grading process for the February, 1974 Bar examination without authority; indeed, contrary to the express rule of the Arizona Supreme Court, as discussed in Respondent's Brief in Opposition to the Petition for Certiorari¹.

CONCLUSION

The Petition for Certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted

Edward Ronwin
P.O. Box 3585
Urbandale, Iowa 50322
(515) 223-8819
Respondent pro se

¹ Respondent filed a "pendent" Cross-Petition for Certiorari, assigned No. 82-1573, based on Rule 19.5 of this Court. On or about April 22, 1983, Petitioners have filed a Brief in Opposition to said Cross-Petition which presents an identical argument to that in Petitioners' Supplemental Brief to which this Brief in Opposition is addressed. Respondent asks this Court in the interest of avoiding accumulation of excess paper and in view of the pendent quality of the Cross-Petition, to consider this Brief in Opposition, or at least the argument made herein, as Respondent's Reply Brief to Petitioner's Brief in Opposition to said Cross-Petition in No. 82-1573.